

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 7, 15, 23, 33 and 39 have been amended. Claims 1-48 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant traverses the Office's rejections and respectfully requests that the application be forwarded on to issuance.

### The § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-11, 15-29, 33-43, 47, and 48 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over the white paper entitled "Understanding Universal Plug and Play" (hereinafter "MS"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,636,211 to Newlin, et al. (hereinafter, "Newlin"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,771,317 to Ellis, et al. (hereinafter, "Ellis").

Claims 12-14, 30-32, and 44-46 stand rejected under § 103(a) as being obvious over MS, in view of Newlin, and further in view of Ellis, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,711,630 to Dubal et al. (hereinafter "Dubal"). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the reasons set forth below.

### The Claims

**Claim 1** has been amended and, as amended, recites a method of tuning an information presentation appliance comprising [added language appears in the bold italics]:

- receiving user input specifying at least one category of information to be blocked from presentation on the appliance, wherein the category is associated with at least one user-defined keyword *created and entered by a user*;
- creating a device description page using a markup language;
- storing data representing the categories of information specified by the user in the device description page; and
- transmitting the device description page with the data representing the categories of information and the user-defined keyword through a network.”

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office admits that the combination of MS and Newlin fails to teach blocking of categories of information where the categories are associated with at least one user-defined keyword. However, the Office argues that Ellis teaches “a Parental Guidance system for blocking viewing of channels, similar to that of MS and Newlin, but further teaches blocking categories of information from display such as items in a ‘Parental Guidance’ category including user specifiable keywords representing sub-categories of Violent Content, Nudity, Language, Adult Situation, and Parental Discretion, a ‘Rating Category’ including user specifiable keywords representing sub-categories of PG, R, etc.” (Office Action dated 1/19/2006, Pages 3-4). The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office and, for the reasons discussed below, traverses the Office’s rejections.

In order to clarify its subject matter, claim 1 has been amended to recite receiving user input specifying at least one category of information to be blocked from presentation on the appliance, wherein the category is associated with at least

one user-defined keyword *created and entered by a user*. Ellis does not in any way teach or suggest receiving user input specifying at least one category of information to be blocked from presentation on the appliance, wherein *the category is associated with at least one user-defined keyword created and entered by a user*. In order to assist the Office in better understanding the claimed subject matter, an excerpt from the Applicant's specification is reproduced below:

**Page 25, Lines 4-13 of The Applicant's Specification**

Returning to Figure 3, an EPF 124 is shown in the living room 106. The EPF can present the user an interface to allow the user to select the image or video clip categories to be presented on the EPF 124. As will be described further below, the user can be presented with a generic list of categories of images to be displayed, *and an opportunity to enter keywords to further define the categories*. Thus, for display in the living room, the user might select a "family" category and a "friends" category, *and can enter further keywords, such as the names of the family members, or the locations that the family went on vacation to further define the category of images*. The user can also be allowed to enter keywords of images the user does not wish to be displayed in the living room, such as advertisements, coupons, or delivery room pictures of the user's children.

As should become even more apparent in light of this excerpt the claimed subject matter blocks categories of information that are associated with at least one user-defined keyword created and entered by a user. Examples of user-defined keywords created and entered by a user include advertisement, coupons, delivery room pictures and the like.

Ellis, on the other hand, does not allow a user to create and enter his or her own keywords. Ellis forces the user to select a category from a list of categories that has already been created. For example, as taught by Ellis, a user can select to block all movies rated "R" or all movies containing Nudity. However, these

categories of information have been pre-defined by some other party. The user does not create and enter these words, but rather scrolls through a list of available categories and then clicks on the pre-defined categories of his or her choice. If for example, the user wants to further define the category of R rated movies to include R rated movies starring the actor Tom Cruise, the user will be unable to create and enter the words "Tom Cruise." To this extent, Ellis teaches directly away from the subject matter of this claim.

Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, the combination of MS, Newlin, and Ellis does not teach or in any way suggest the subject matter of this claim and, in point of fact, teaches away therefrom. Accordingly, the Office has failed to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness, and this claim is allowable.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claim are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

**Claim 7** recites a method of tuning an information presentation appliance comprising [added language appears in the bold italics]:

- receiving a device description page written in a markup language;
- parsing the device description page to identify available categories of information, and to identify at least one user-defined keyword ***that has been input by a user and is*** associated with at least one of the categories;

- presenting the available categories of information to a user;
- receiving user input at the information presentation appliance specifying selected categories of information to be blocked from presentation on the information presentation appliance; and
- invoking a deliver function referenced by a service description page to receive an element of information belonging to a category other than the selected categories of information.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office uses much the same argument as used in making out a rejection of claim 1. This claim has been amended to recite parsing the device description page to identify available categories of information, and to identify at least one *user-defined keyword that has been input by a user* and is associated with at least one of the categories. The combination cited by the Office does not in any way teach or suggest parsing the device description page to identify available categories of information, and to identify at least one *user-defined keyword that has been input by a user* and is associated with at least one of the categories.

For at least this reason, the Office has failed to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness. As such, this claim is allowable.

**Claims 8-14** depend from claim 7 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claim are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 7, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

**Claim 15** recites an information presentation appliance comprising [added language appears in the bold italics]:

- a user input device for enabling a user to specify categories of information to be blocked from presentation on the information presentation appliance, wherein at least one of the categories is associated with at least one user-defined keyword *that has been keyed in by a user*;
- a processing unit for performing steps comprising: creating a device description page written in a markup language and containing data representing the categories of information and the user-defined keyword specified by the user through the user input device;
- a memory storage for performing steps comprising: storing the device description page; and
- a network connection for performing steps comprising: transmitting the device description page.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office uses much the same argument as used in making out a rejection of claim 1. This claim has been amended to recite a user input device for enabling a user to specify categories of information to be blocked from presentation on the information presentation appliance, wherein at least one of the categories is associated with at least one user-defined keyword *that has been keyed in by a user*. The combination cited by the Office does not in any way teach or suggest the subject matter of this claim.

For at least this reason, the Office has failed to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness. As such, this claim is allowable.

**Claims 16-22** depend from claim 15 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claim are also allowable for their own recited

features which, in combination with those recited in claim 15, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

**Claim 23** recites an information presentation appliance comprising [added language appears in the bold italics]:

- a network connection for performing steps comprising: receiving a device description page written in a markup language;
- a user input device for performing steps comprising: receiving user input specifying selected categories of information to be blocked from presentation on the information presentation appliance, wherein at least one of the categories is associated with at least one user-defined keyword ***input by a user***; and
- a processing unit for performing steps comprising:
  - parsing the device description page to identify at least one available category of information and at least one user-defined keyword associated with the category; and
  - invoking a deliver function referenced by a service description page to receive an element of information belonging to a category other than the selected categories of information.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office uses much the same argument as used in making out a rejection of claim 1. This claim has been amended to recite a user input device for performing steps comprising: receiving user input specifying selected categories of information to be blocked from presentation on the information presentation appliance, wherein at least one of the categories is associated with at least one user-defined keyword ***input by a user***. The combination cited by the Office does not in any way teach or suggest the subject matter of this claim.

For at least this reason, the Office has failed to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness. As such, this claim is allowable.

**Claims 24-32** depend from claim 23 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claim are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 23, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

**Claim 33** recites a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for tuning an information presentation appliance, the computer-executable instructions performing steps comprising: [added language appears in the bold italics]:

- receiving user input specifying categories of information to be blocked from presentation on the information presentation appliance, wherein at least one of the categories is associated with at least one user-defined keyword *input by a user*;
- creating a device description page using a markup language;
- storing data representing the categories of information and the user-defined keyword specified by the user in the device description page; and
- transmitting the device description page with the categories of information through a network.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office uses much the same argument as used in making out a rejection of claim 1. This claim has been amended to recite receiving user input specifying categories of information to be blocked from presentation on the information presentation appliance, wherein at

least one of the categories is associated with at least one user-defined keyword *input by a user*. The combination cited by the Office does not in any way teach or suggest the subject matter of this claim.

For at least this reason, the Office has failed to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness. As such, this claim is allowable.

Claims 34-38 depend from claim 33 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claim are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 33, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 39 recites a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for tuning an information presentation appliance, the computer-executable instructions performing steps comprising [added language appears in the bold italics]:

- receiving a device description page written in a markup language;
- parsing the device description page to identify available categories of information, wherein at least one of the categories is associated with at least one user-defined keyword *that has been keyed in by a user*;
- presenting the available categories of information to a user;
- receiving user input at the information presentation appliance specifying selected categories of information to be blocked from presentation on the information presentation appliance; and
- invoking a deliver function referenced by a service description page to receive an element of information belonging to a category other than the selected categories of information.

In making out a rejection of this claim, the Office uses much the same argument as used in making out a rejection of claim 1. This claim has been amended to recite parsing the device description page to identify available categories of information, wherein at least one of the categories is associated with at least one user-defined keyword *that has been keyed in by a user*. The combination cited by the Office does not in any way teach or suggest the subject matter of this claim.

For at least this reason, the Office has failed to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness. As such, this claim is allowable.


**Claims 40-48** depend from claim 39 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 39, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

### **Conclusion**

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4/17/06

By:   
Lance R. Sadler  
Reg. No. 38,605  
(509) 324-9256